



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

transmitted by the teachers and preachers of the Church from age to age, beginning with the Apostolic times. And, when they are driven from this position also, they finally trench themselves in what they deem the impregnable fortress of the authority of the living Church, which is invested with an infallible judicial power in articles of faith. This is a very summary and convenient mode of terminating a troublesome discussion, and accordingly, as might be expected, Roman Catholic controversialists avail themselves largely of it. It becomes, then, an inevitable and a most important question—Does such an infallible authority exist? and what are the proofs upon which its supposed existence rests?

Three classes of argument may be, and generally are, adduced to prove the infallibility of the Church of Rome—First, *a priori* arguments, derived from the nature of the case, and from the necessity which exists for an infallible interpreter of Scripture, and judge of controversy.

Secondly—Arguments drawn from Scripture, such as our Lord's commission to his Apostles, and His promises to Peter in particular.

Thirdly—Arguments derived from the history of the Church, and the recorded testimony of the earlier Fathers.

It is to the last of these heads that we propose to direct our immediate attention. The others have already been partially discussed in this Journal, and shall be more fully handled in succeeding Numbers.

Before we enter on our proposed subject, it may be well to premise a few observations relative to the defects under which, regarded even as a theory, the dogma of Infallibility still labours, and the consequent obscurity and uncertainty which we have to encounter in discussing it.

First, then, we are not told how we may be infallibly certain that such an attribute as Infallibility has been bestowed upon the Church at all: and, secondly, supposing it to have been conferred, we are not informed where it resides, what is its visible centre and organ. In other words, we are not told *who* or *what* is infallible, or *why*. The Council of Trent, which decided so many points, determined nothing on the great subject of Infallibility. Nor was the omission undesigned. The Papal Legates were strictly enjoined, on no account whatever, to allow any discussion concerning the authority of the Pope. The cause of this reserve it is not difficult to assign, when we bear in mind that the opinions of some of the greatest authorities of the Church of Rome have been, and still are, divided as to the seat of Infallibility. There are, at least, six different opinions upon the subject: some lodging the gift with the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*; others, with the Pope in the council of Cardinals; others, with the Pope in a general or provincial council; others, in a general council without the Pope; and others, lastly, in the Church diffusive—that is to say, in the whole body of believers throughout the world. Under these six general heads may be found grouped a great number of minor differences. Nor is this all. Even though we should grant (what Bellarmine maintains is agreed upon by all the members of his church) that infallibility is lodged with the Pope in general council, yet it has never been formally determined what Popes have been *true* Popes; which of the many *de facto*, or rival Popes, are to be acknowledged *de jure*. Nor, again, which of the many professed General Councils are really so. A Roman Catholic might, at this moment, deny the existing Pope to be the successor of St. Peter, without offending against any article of his creed. And, as to General Councils, while the Gallican Church receives the Councils of Basil and Constance wholly, the Roman Church rejects them both in part. The acts of other Councils are admitted to be adulterated, without any attempt being made to correct them. "This inconsistency in the Romish system," to use the language of the celebrated Dr. Newman, "one might almost call providential. Nothing could be better adapted than it is to defeat the devices of human wisdom, and to show to thoughtful inquirers the hollowness of even the most specious counterfeit of Divine truth. The theologians of Rome have been able dexterously to smoothen over a thousand inconsistencies, and to array the heterogeneous precedents of centuries, in the semblance of design and harmony. But they cannot complete their system in its most important and essential point. They *can* determine, in theory, the nature, degree, extent, and object of the infallibility which they claim; they *cannot* agree among themselves *where* it resides. As in the building of Babel, the Lord has confounded their language, and the structure stands half finished, a monument at once of human daring and its failure."

No wonder, then, that the Council of Trent did not see fit to lay down any positive statement respecting a point so much contested as this, especially as the claim to Papal infallibility was not distinctly asserted until the dawn of the Reformation. This we shall hereafter prove by the conclusive evidence of facts; for the present we shall content ourselves with merely stating it in general terms. Nor, be it remembered, is this assertion, however startling it may appear, made only by Protestants. The main object of the famous Bossuet's Vindication of the Gallican Synod of 1682, was to prove that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope was altogether of modern origin; that for many centuries it had never been held under any form; and that, even down to the 16th century, there were ample

proofs of its not having been regarded as an article of faith. He proves this by the decrees of Councils, by the testimony of Fathers, Doctors, and Schoolmen, and by the declarations of Popes themselves, amongst others by the following words of Pope Hadrian VI., when he was professor at Louvain—"If by the Roman Church he meant its Head, the Pontiff, it is certain that he may err, even in things pertaining to faith, in asserting heresy either by his decision or decretal; for many Roman pontiffs have been heretics."* Such was the opinion of the famous Bishop of Meaux, of whom Roman Catholics are so justly proud. This opinion was also maintained by the great Church historians Fleury and Dupin. These profound scholars knew full well, and were honest enough to confess it, that the evidence of ecclesiastical history was utterly opposed to the modern doctrine of the infallibility of the Church of Rome. They knew full well that Pope Liberius had fallen into Arianism, and Pope Vigilius into Eutychianism. They knew that Pope Honorius espoused the heresy of the Monothelites, and was condemned as a heresiarch by Pope Leo II. and his successors.† They knew that the profession of faith of the Popes in the 9th century contained the following clause, in which the possession of infallibility is expressly disclaimed—"We strictly anathematize those, whether ourselves or any others, who shall presume to put forward anything novel, contrary to the evangelical tradition, and the integrity of the orthodox faith and the Christian religion; or shall attempt to change anything, or subtract from the integrity of our faith, or consent to those who, with sacrilegious daring, presume to do so."‡

It is, we repeat, no wonder that the Council of Trent, with such irresistible evidence before it as to the comparative novelty of the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church of Rome, carefully abstained from publishing any decree upon the subject. In our next number we shall proceed to show more in detail that the existing records of Christian antiquity utterly refute the notion of an infallible authority being lodged in any manner in the Church, and specially that the Church of Rome was at any time regarded as its depository.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON THE USE OF THE BIBLE.

BY HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN.

(Continued from page 77.)

In our last number we gave our readers the threefold grounds on which Cardinal Wiseman states that his Church refuses to give the Bible indifferently to all.

The Cardinal proceeds thus:—

"Immediately we hear the words, 'Ha! You own you are afraid of the Bible—you dare not trust your people with it. You acknowledge that if they read it, they would abandon the unity of the Church, and seek relief in the liberty of the Gospel.' To this we reply, that we fear anything which we see in others baneful."

He then goes on to argue that in early times the indiscriminate reading of Scripture was an impossibility, because few could read; the faithful heard the word read in the Church, and heard the sermons of Augustine, Chrysostom, or Ambrose. "The instances were few in which any one dreamt of judging for himself, and when he did, he became a schismatic or a heretic. The Church continued through centuries, and as the deepening darkness of the ages into which she descended clouded literature, the more difficult became self-willed interpretation. But, when a revived civilization infused a bold spirit into the world, with the learning of the Pagans came back their haughty spirit. Sensualism incarnated in Luther, fatalism embodied in Calvin, the luxury and the philosophy of ancient Rome, its epicureanism and its stoicism, came to battle with the Church. Luther, by teaching that every man may sin as he likes, if he only have faith—Calvin, by proclaiming that a predestined fatalism imperiously domineers over his actions, opened each his door to vice and crime, unchecked and unbounded. Both agreed in one means of gaining partisans, by setting up the private judgment—that is, the pride of each one, against what had held undisputed sway over the minds of all. Whoever read the Bible was to get rid of all the restraints and holy ordinances of confession, fasting, mortification, monachism, celibacy, penances, &c., and was to live by a rule of his own making, in the liberty which his passions could wring from conscience." The Church, to meet this evil, struck at the root of it, encountered its principle. This was, had the individual the right—not merely to read, but to interpret Scripture according to his private judgment, and follow this in preference to the Church's teaching? To this she answered—"No." But the evil was practical; she met it by separating the two—the

reading and the interpretation. She allows the first—"where there is no danger of the second." Three things were necessary for this division: First—an accurate version; secondly—such annotations as keep before the reader the Church's teaching; and, thirdly—such good sense, knowledge, and piety, as would give security that the reader did not belong to the class of "the unlearned and unstable," and would not prefer his own fancies to the authorized interpretations of the Church. To all who came within these conditions, the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue was, and is, permitted. The pastors of the church could alone be the judges of their existence. "In countries like this,* in which the very antagonism of Catholics with Protestants keeps alive, and before their minds constantly, the two opposing principles of Church authority and free judgment, restriction is less necessary and scarcely exists; and, on the other hand, in Catholic countries, such as can read, or do read, have access to the Latin version without restraint."

An historical glance at the Reformation, by a Roman Catholic prelate, would be incomplete indeed if it did not include the usual misrepresentations respecting Luther and Calvin. They persuade themselves, by what process of reasoning we know not, that the merits of the controversy are affected by the personal character of the former, and by charges of sensuality against him. The Church of England does not pledge herself to follow the views of either Luther or Calvin, and we advert to this part of the subject not to refute any charge against either of those eminent men, but merely to say in passing, that nothing can be more untrue or inaccurate than the representation given here by Cardinal Wiseman of their doctrines. Nowhere has Luther maintained that "A man may sin as he likes, if he only have faith," and we do not believe that Calvin ever proclaimed "that a predestined fatalism imperiously domineers over men's actions." Predestination and election are not doctrines confined exclusively to the followers of Calvin, and have been as much maintained and controverted among divines of the Church of Rome themselves as they are among Protestants.

The Cardinal then proceeds to say, that though the Scriptures may be permitted, without restraint, to those who can read Latin, yet the church does not urge them on the people, does not encourage them to read them, does not spread them to the utmost; and for the following reasons:—Whatever is God's work is made at once complete; he "rests from it" when he has accomplished it. Modifications and variations may appear in its secondary parts, but as to organization all is perfect. Thus it was with the creation—so with man. What God does in the physical world, created that man might live, he has done in the spiritual order, established that man might live for ever. When God bestows a system for the spiritual and eternal life it is by revelation. The first revelation completely developed was the old law. This system was delivered in a few days; the brief code of ten moral precepts, the full system of ecclesiastical law, the doctrine of clean and unclean, a priesthood, a worship, a ritual, a calendar—all was given at once; and, to this (saving additional commemorative festivals) nothing was ever added. Yet, at this time, the Book of Genesis (and perhaps that of Job) was the most that was written; the Pentateuch was finished in forty years; then some historical books were added—Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and Kings. How were men saved in the meantime? How could worship be carried on without the chants of David? Four hundred years passed before this, to us apparently necessary, portion of the Old Testament was composed, &c. The giving of the Jewish law was the work then of a few hours; the formation of its Scriptures was the work of a thousand years. The first resembled the creation of man; the second, the record of his civilization. The first was life, the second culture. Whatever was necessary to life, that is, salvation, was complete at once. Comparing this course of the first revelation with that of the second, Cardinal Wiseman commences with the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, which he likens to that of the same spirit on the chaotic elements of the material world. In the apostles there were laid up, unconsciously, the rudiments of the future church—its primacy, episcopate, priesthood, sacraments, powers. There lay locked up commissions of boundless magnitude, to be teachers of the learned, conquerors of the strong, confounders of the proud, salt of the earth, light of the world. When the Spirit descended on them, their latent powers burst into life; the Church in all its perfection and beauty is born to all the world, to all ages. Not to mention Mary, who, the Cardinal asserts, was present, with others, when three thousand laymen were joined to the clergy in a few hours. As completely as the child is the same as the man, so is the Church of Whitsunday that of the third or the nineteenth century. The hierarchy, which is to spread its harmonious rule over the world is there, and Peter already leads its force, and centres in himself its union. The faithful are gathered round them, not to dispute but to learn; they persevered in the breaking of bread, which the Cardinal calls the eucharistic sacrifice and sacrament. Many came to the Apostles confessing their sins, who placed their hands on the baptized, gave them the Holy Ghost—ordained new ministers; and soon the sick were anointed with oil, and

* Si per Ecclesiam Romanam intelligatur caput ejus, puta Pontifex, certum est quod possit errare, etiam in illis que tangunt fidem, hæresim per suam determinationem aut decretalem asserendo; plures enim fuerunt Pontifices Romani hæretici.

† In the "Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum" (ed. Paris, 1680), which was used in the 8th century at the consecration of the Popes, we find the following solemn public declaration made by them:—"Auctores novi hæretici dogmatis Sergium, &c., unum cum Honorio qui præbuit auctoritatem fomentum impendit, cum supra factis hæreticis, Sabellium, &c., excommunicat ac condemnamus."

‡ Unde et districti anathematis interdictioni subijcimus, si quis unquam, seu nos, sive est alius, qui novum aliquid præsumat contra hujusmodi evangelicam traditionem, et orthodoxam fidem Christianamque religionem interpretatam; vel quidquam contrarium annuendo immutari, sive subtrahere de integritate fidelis nostre tentaverit, vel ausu sacrilego hoc præsumendum consentire."

* We think if Cardinal Wiseman had been as familiar as we are with the state of Ireland, he would scarcely have ventured on such an assertion. We should like to know the name of the parish in Ireland where such restriction scarcely exists!

were healed in soul and body. There was no room for further revelation. Whatever might be written by an inspired apostle could only be a record of what was already known and believed, a truly important, sacred, invaluable record—a treasure of wisdom—a gift of God, but still incapable of adding to the deposit of faith safely lodged in the Church's keeping. The first Gospel does not appear for twelve years after; and the Gospel of St. John was not written for sixty years after the death of our Lord. If this Gospel had formed a part of a plan of essential salvation, St. John would not have risked such a lengthened space, till he was an aged man, &c. It was, in fact, a new heresy that tempted him to write: had it come a few years later we might have been deprived of his heavenly Gospel. We cannot imagine how a spiritual Jew lived, before a psalm, or a proverb, or prophecy enlightened him, or how Christians grew to perfection, and died for the faith, before a line of the New Testament was penned. They heard, no doubt, the words and actions of our Lord, but only from faithful witnesses—not under the safe-guard of inspiration. Might not the reminiscences written down fresh have satisfied future ages as well, and yet inspiration have been withheld? And as to faith, Jesus Christ had not promised inspiration to his Apostles' writing, but infallibility in teaching. Still the Church, with gratitude and reverence, accepts, cherishes, and prizes the gift of his words to man. When she unfolds it, and reads to her children the smallest passage of her spouse's life, she orders the tapers of the sanctuary to burn round it, and the incense to perfume the atmosphere, and when the priest kisses the blessed text, and whispers his prayer—"Per evangelica dicta delectantur nostra delicta," he expresses more confidence in the Gospel than all the speeches in Exeter Hall can match. Nothing can exceed the value the Church sets on this inheritance, which is exclusively hers, and of which she alone holds the record and the key. But she would be departing from her duty, and from truth, if she held out the Scriptures as the appointed channels of salvation. These existed in their fulness before they were written; in the old law before the Bible; in the new, before the Testament. The means of eternal life contained by the Church are what she urges on the people; she desires them to employ the means of grace confided to her alone—the ministry of her priesthood, in exhortation, reproof, advice, direction—the devout use of the sacraments, especially penance and the eucharist—the employment of prayer, meditation, and watchfulness over the conscience. Such are the means by which saving grace was given. To Bible reading no such gift has been attached. The Cardinal professes to answer the difficulty which he anticipates—that as each book was added to the canon of the Old Testament, a new obligation was imposed of receiving and believing that book; and so a new condition of salvation was added to the law; and so the compilation of the new brought with it a new belief in its inspiration and truth, and thus modified the terms of salvation originally granted. He gives what he terms a brief and simple answer. In each case provision is made for the future contingency. In the old law Moses teaches that prophets will arise which they must hear (quoting Deut. xviii., 18), and the new law had its provision for future inspiration. And where? In the belief of that authority which could alone attest inspiration and sanction a canon. What the line of prophets was in the old law, the unbroken continuance of Divine authority is in the new. It was the church which gave to Christendom a uniform canon, a work not completed till the age of councils. The principle of believing whatever the Church should define, is the very first and fundamental one laid down in the organization of the Church from the beginning. It is not a new condition of salvation, but only an application of one laid down at the very births of Judaism and of Christianity.

We have abstracted this argument at some length, and in Cardinal Wiseman's own words, in order to give the fairest view of its substance; and we would ask, is there from beginning to end of it an argument against at least the free reading of the Scriptures, or a reason why the Roman Catholic Church, even while she denies the right to interpret Scripture, should not urge the reading of it, in her own authorized translation, on every one of her members who is able to read? We regret that want of space prevents us from examining every part of this argument in detail. We must content ourselves with a few words by way of caution to such of our readers as might be misled by specious language, addressed to minds predisposed to that side of the question. First, Cardinal Wiseman professes to give reasons for not urging and encouraging the reading of the Scriptures; what he does defend, however, is a very different thing—namely, that his church does not hold out the Scriptures to man "as the appointed channels of salvation," which, he says, "existed in their fulness before they were written," &c. A good deal may turn upon the meaning of terms; if these words were understood in their ordinary sense we should say, "neither do Protestants so hold them out." Our present purpose, however, is merely to point out that the Cardinal shifts his ground, and writes in defence of one thing while professing to excuse another. It is clear, that though his church considers her own authority and the means she says she possesses as the appointed channels of salvation, and holds them and not the Scriptures out as such, this does not afford a reason for not encouraging the reading of Scripture, and inviting her children to view and examine this "charter of her authority,"

this "storehouse of her evidences," this "armoury of her defence."

Secondly, There is nothing in this argument which might not have been, with equal force, replied to our Saviour, when he referred the Jews to the Scriptures, as bearing testimony of him, and when he told them that they erred, "not knowing the Scriptures." They might have answered—"We set an inestimable value on those invaluable records, those treasures of wisdom, but we will not encourage the reading of them, because the law was delivered to Moses in a few hours, and the Scriptures were not completed for centuries after; they were incapable of adding to the deposit of faith safely lodged in the church's keeping." Our Saviour would have replied to them, as he did at times prove them—"In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." "Why do you transgress the commandment of God by your traditions?" "Ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your traditions," &c.

Thirdly, Great care and caution is necessary in reading this argument, and, indeed, the whole tract, to distinguish between what is true and what is false—what is supported by reference to Divine authority, and what rests upon bare assertion, sometimes on bare insinuation. The fanciful deposit of the rudiments, the primacy, the episcopate, the priesthood, the sacraments, the powers of the church, with the boundless commissions, and the titles of highest dignity in the persons of the Apostles while yet rude and uninspired, is a tasteful and poetical idea, but it has no other foundation than the brilliant imagination of Cardinal Wiseman. The division of the persons present at the feast of Pentecost into clergy and laity, and the representation of the hierarchy as led by Peter, rest upon no better basis. The interpretation of the words "breaking of bread" into the Eucharistic sacrifice, the application of the anointing with oil, &c., are matters of controversy; and our objection to the use of them in this argument is, that though Cardinal Wiseman's arguments are written for Roman Catholics, yet, when one undertakes to answer objections, he should not do so on grounds which the objectors themselves deny to be true. If he does not undertake to give an answer resting on undisputed facts or doctrines, but upon grounds established by the authority of his Church alone, there is no use in this elaborate reasoning at all. The short proposition—"the Church wills it"—is sufficient in the eyes of his Roman Catholic readers; at least it is as convincing as a long train of argument referable in the end to the same ground. The same may be said of the argument founded on the text—"If he will not hear the Church," &c. It is founded upon what Protestants assert is a perversion of the text, and also upon the assumption that the Church of Rome is identical with the primitive Church; that the "Church of Whitsunday" is the Roman Catholic Church of "the nineteenth century."

Cardinal Wiseman concludes with an eloquent protestation of the great love and reverence in which he holds the written Word, the "book of his predilection from earliest youth." What a pity that his love should resemble that of the miser, who hoards his treasure and hides it from the public view, instead of putting it in circulation, for the benefit of himself and the community! What boots it that the kiss, unmatched by the speeches of Exeter Hall, is imprinted on its page, that tapers are lighted about it, that the air is perfumed around it with incense, while it lies closed before the priest? The primary object apparent throughout this tract, that which suggests every disparaging expression, which dictates each irreverent jest at the Bible, its readers, and its "ludicrous translations," is the exaltation of the priesthood, and the complete subjection of the laity—body, soul, and mind—beneath the yoke of their authority. If, in his zeal for this object, Cardinal Wiseman has used arguments unworthy of his high reputation and acknowledged ability, we will do him the justice to express our opinion that he was forced to resort to them for lack of better.

We now take leave of him, wishing him, notwithstanding all his professions, more love, more reverence for the Word of God, and a more constant perusal and study of its pages, commending to his attention especially those parts where our Lord directs that His Gospel shall be preached, (not necessarily by word of mouth only,) proclaimed and published, not only to every nation, but to every creature; and we venture to assure him that no impediment he can raise, no frantic efforts of his Church and her priesthood, can impede the working of the wonderful and glorious Word of God; that it will still have "free course;" it will never return void to its Giver, but will prosper in the thing whereunto He hath sent it, and by its blessed influence, diffused throughout the whole earth, there will, spite of Priest, Pope, or Cardinal, be daily added to THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST such as shall be saved.

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.

NO. II.

In illustrating the mode of hereditary succession to ecclesiastical offices and benefices, which prevailed among the ancient Irish, we commenced with a case connected with Clonmacnoise, because the accidental circumstance of the great eminence and repute in their native Church to which the family brought under our notice in that instance attained, has been the means of preserving to us a much more detailed and accurate account of such

a succession in their case, than we are able to cite in any other. Next, it might seem a natural course for us to direct our inquiries to the principal religious establishments founded by the three Patron Saints of Ireland, and examine how far anything similar to what we have noticed at Clonmacnoise, may be observable in connection with them—i. e. with Armagh, St. Patrick's principal foundation; Derry and Iona, similarly connected with the name of St. Columbkille; and Kildare, no less famously associated with the memory of St. Brigid. It will be more convenient, however, to pursue a somewhat different order, and, before coming to speak of these last-named foundations, to refer to some other cases which furnish very striking illustrations of the topic now under examination.

1. The interesting ruins of the old church of Killeshim, situated about two Irish miles west of the town of Carlow, mark a spot which was distinguished, in very early times of Irish Church history, as the site of an ecclesiastical establishment of no small celebrity—it having been presided over in the beginning of the tenth century by one who bore the dignity of Archbishop of Leinster. The first mention of the place (by its ancient name, Gleann Usean) in the Annals of the Four Masters, is at A.D. 843, where we read that "Aedhan, of Gleann Usean, died" in that year. From this period on to A.D. 1082, the place is repeatedly mentioned in the same Annals; and in the interval between occur the obits [i. e. entries of the deaths] of nine Abbots and one Erenach. Among these are the following:—

A.D. 874. DERMOT, son of Corprey, Abbot of Gleann Usean, died.

A.D. 915. [At the great battle of Confey, near Leixlip, fell, among others of the nobility] the archbishop MAELMOGUE, son of Dermot, who was of the Ui-Conannla [tribe], a distinguished scribe, anchorite, &c.

A.D. 917. DONNELL, son of Dermot, Abbot of Gleann Usean, died.

A.D. 938. ANVEY, son of Donnell, Abbot of Gleann Usean, died.

A.D. 946. CASEY, son of Donnell, Abbot of Gleann Usean, died.

A.D. 951. FELIMY, foster son of Maelmogue, Abbot of Gleann Usean, sage of Leinster, died.

A.D. 977. FLAN, son of Maelmogue, Erenach of Gleann Usean, died.

A.D. 986. KENCORACH, son of Anvey, Abbot of Gleann Usean, died.

A.D. 1016. DERMOT Ua Maelmogue [i. e. grandson, or descendant, of Maelmogue], Abbot of Gleann Usean, died.

The first abbot here named [i. e. Dermot] was accordingly, as it seems, father to the two next abbots, Maelmogue and Donnell. His son, Maelmogue, who succeeded him, was archbishop as well as abbot, and was father to the Erenach FLAN, mentioned in the seventh entry above. Donnell, brother and successor to Maelmogue, was father to Abbot Casey, named in the fifth entry. Abbot Anvey, successor to Donnell, was father to abbot Kencorach, named in the eighth entry. Abbot Felimy succeeded as foster son (a relationship valued among the Irish as much as that of natural sonship), to Archbishop Maelmogue. Perhaps Maelmogue adopted him before the birth of his own son, FLAN, who was Erenach of the place more than twenty-five years afterwards.

As it would be tedious to repeat similar observations on all the cases of successions of this kind which remain to be submitted to the reader's notice, we shall, in those which next follow, merely give the lists of names and dates from the Annals of the Four Masters, and trust to the reader's sagacity to observe the interesting connection that seems to subsist between the several parties concerned.

2. In connection with the church of Killtoom, near Castlepollard, in the County Westmeath, five obits of ecclesiastics occur in the Annals. Four of which are these following:—

A.D. 746. Eochy, of Killtoom, died.

A.D. 808. Kellach, son of Eochy, Abbot of Killtoom, died.

A.D. 849. Colga, son of Kellach, Abbot of Killtoom, died.

A.D. 883. ROVERTACH, son of Colga,* Abbot of Killtoom, died.

3. Lusk is a very well-known place in the County Dublin, midway between the Irish metropolis and the town of Drogheda. Its church was also a very distinguished one in ancient times, as appears by the frequent mention made of it in the Irish Annals. The following interesting list of abbots and other official persons belonging to it, is constructed from the notices of the place, occurring in the Four Masters:—

A.D. 731. CRUNMAEL, son of Colga, Abbot of Lusk, [died].

A.D. 779 [properly, 784], CONALL, son of Crunmael, Abbot of Lusk, [died].

* In this entry, Dr. O'Donovan's translation has Colgan, by mistake, for Colga; Colgan, in the original, being the genitive case of the name Colga, or Colgu. If Colgan were the right English, the original should have been Colgain, the genitive of Colgan. We omit giving the Irish in full, to save space for more copious extracts.